Objective Existence Method (OEM) Manual

Introduction

The Objective Existence Method (OEM) is an evidence-based logic and reason quality assurance program crafted to uncover objective truths—facts rooted in reality, independent of the mind. By blending observation with logical reasoning, OEM constructs logos (truth-based worldview, morals, and politics) while shielding against anti-logos (falsehoods from imagination or consensus that lead to oppression). This manual details OEM's principles, offers a clear step-by-step guide, and includes a glossary, empowering anyone to apply it and distinguish reality from fiction.

Foundations of OEM

OEM rests on two core pillars:

1. Evidence as Objective Existence: Truth begins with what can be observed and demonstrated through physical senses (sight, sound, touch, etc.), existing independently of thought or imagination.
    - Example: I see a light; it exists. I imagine a dragon; it doesn't.
2. Logic and Reason: Three methods—abduction, deduction, and induction—organize observations into valid conclusions, adhering to the laws of logic (Identity, No Contradiction, No Middle Ground).

OEM rejects unproven claims, demanding every premise reflect observable reality.

Key Principles

Authorities of Truth

OEM identifies three sources people claim as truth, validating only one:

1. Objective Existence: Phenomena existing independently of the mind, observable and demonstrable (e.g., a sound). The sole authority in OEM.
2. Wordism: Mind-dependent claims, unprovable by observation (e.g., "I feel it's true"). Rejected as anti-logos.
3. Totemism: Claims from consensus or authority, lacking evidence (e.g., "Experts agree"). Rejected as anti-logos.

Rules for Evidence

- Only phenomena proven to objectively exist can be premises.
- Objective existences cannot contradict—they disprove beliefs, not facts.
- If it doesn't objectively exist, it cannot be a premise.

Syllogism Requirement

Reasoning must be in syllogistic form (Premise 1, Premise 2, Conclusion) for transparency, preventing bias and exposing errors like fallacies.

- Note on "I": In syllogisms, "I" (e.g., "I see") isn't a presupposition of existence—it's the observer relaying their thought process. Existence is concluded, not assumed, based on evidence (see OEM Example).

The OEM Process

OEM uses three reasoning methods in sequence:

1. Abduction: Establishes what exists in objective reality.
    - Formula: B – A = A (subtract what doesn't exist to find what does).
    - Purpose: Filters reality to set premises, guiding deduction or induction.
2. Deduction: Derives certain conclusions from abduced premises.
    - Formula: A + B = C (combine truths for a definite outcome).
    - Use: When one category is evidenced (e.g., data exists).
3. Induction: Infers probable conclusions when multiple categories are abduced.
    - Formula: p(A / B) = A / B (probability of A given B).
    - Use: When evidence supports competing possibilities (e.g., data as sensory or imagined, if both proven).

Step-by-Step Guide to Using OEM

Apply OEM to any question or claim with these steps:

Step 1: State the Question

- Define the inquiry clearly.
- Example: "Does data exist, and do I exist because I think?"

Step 2: Perform Abduction

- Goal: Determine what exists in objective reality.
- Process:
    1. List observations using physical senses.
    2. Verify evidence (demonstrable existence) for each.

3. Eliminate what lacks evidence.

- Syllogism:
    - Premise 1: Evidence of X exists (e.g., I observe sounds).
    - Premise 2: No evidence of Y exists (e.g., no data from nothingness).
    - Conclusion: X exists; Y does not.
- Example: "I observe data like sounds; no data arises without existence—data exists."

Step 3: Determine Reasoning Type

- If one category is abduced: Use deduction (e.g., only data exists).
- If multiple categories are abduced: Use induction (e.g., data could be sensory or imagined).
- Example: Only data's existence is abduced—deduction applies.

Step 4: Apply Deduction or Induction

- Deduction:
    - Premise 1: All abduced phenomena are Z (e.g., data exists).
    - Premise 2: This instance is observed (e.g., I use data to think).
    - Conclusion: This instance is Z (e.g., I think).
- Induction:
    - Premise 1: Some phenomena are X (e.g., sensory data).
    - Premise 2: Some are Y (e.g., imagined data).
    - Conclusion: This is probably X or Y.
- Example: "Data exists; I use data to think; therefore, I think."

Step 5: Verify Against Anti-Logos

- Check for Wordism (unproven imagination) or Totemism (consensus without evidence).
- Example: "I exist because I imagine it" is Wordism—rejected.

Step 6: Document in Syllogism

- Write steps in Premise-Conclusion form for clarity and validity.
- Example: See "OEM Example" below.

OEM Example

Question: Does data exist, and do I exist because I think?

1. Abduction:
    - Premise 1: Awareness of something is awareness of something's existence (sight: I see images).
    - Premise 2: The awareness of data such as images, sounds, feelings is something (sight, sound: observable).
    - Conclusion: Therefore, data exists.
2. Reasoning Type: Only data's existence is abduced—deduction applies.
3. Deduction 1:
    - Premise 1: Thinking is using data to form a thought (observable: I process images).
    - Premise 2: I used data to form the thought 'data exists' (sight: I reasoned it).
    - Conclusion: Therefore, I think.
4. Deduction 2:
    - Premise 1: Awareness of thinking is awareness of one's own existence (sight: I notice my thoughts).
    - Premise 2: I am aware that I am thinking (observable: self-reflection).
    - Conclusion: Therefore, I exist.
5. Anti-Logos Check: "I exist because I feel it" is Wordism—rejected; sensory evidence holds.
6. Syllogism: As above—clear and valid.

Explanation of "I":

- The "I" in "I see" or "I think" isn't assuming I exist—it's me relaying my thought process to you. I start with data (images anyone can see), note thinking (data use, observable), and conclude existence (awareness proves it). "I" is the observer reporting evidence, not a presupposition—existence is the end, not the start.

Glossary of Terms

- Abduction: Determining what exists in objective reality by eliminating what doesn't (B – A = A).
- Anti-Logos: False worldviews, morals, or politics from imagination or consensus, not evidence, leading to oppression.

- Automatic Design Process: A process initiated by a conscious agent, running independently afterward (e.g., a clock).
- Conscious Agent: An entity capable of intentional action, observable through effects (e.g., me thinking).
- Deduction: Reasoning from abduced premises to a certain conclusion (A + B = C).
- Design Process: A process requiring a conscious agent, either manual or automatic (e.g., reasoning).
- Evidence: Objective existence—phenomena demonstrable through physical senses, independent of the mind.
- Induction: Reasoning from abduced premises to a probable conclusion when multiple categories exist (p(A / B) = A / B).
- Laws of Logic: Identity (A is A), No Contradiction (A isn't not-A), No Middle Ground (A or not-A).
- Logos: Truth-based worldview, morals, and politics from observation and logic.
- Manual Design Process: A process requiring ongoing conscious intervention (e.g., drawing).
- Natural Process: A hypothesized undesigned process—unproven in OEM.
- Objective Existence: Reality observable through physical senses, independent of thought (true authority).
- Syllogism: A structured argument (Premise 1, Premise 2, Conclusion) for clarity and validity.
- Totemism: Claims based on consensus or authority, not evidence (rejected by OEM).
- Wordism: Claims dependent on imagination, not demonstrable (rejected by OEM).

Tips for Success

- Stick to Senses: Base claims on what you see, hear, or touch—avoid guesses.
- Test Every Term: Verify concepts (e.g., "data")—do they exist objectively?
- Write Syllogisms: Document to spot flaws—non-sequiturs mean trouble.
- Drop Bias: If it's unproven, it's out—no matter how appealing.

Conclusion

OEM is a precise tool for finding truth, ensuring premises are real and reasoning is sound. This manual—through its steps, example (data to existence with "I" explained), and glossary—equips you to tackle questions like "Do I exist?" or others, forging logos and rejecting anti-logos with confidence. Use it to navigate reality clearly and effectively.

Further Explanation Why "I" Isn't a Presupposition

In OEM, nothing is assumed—every premise must be abduced from objective existence (sensory evidence). The "I" in the syllogism isn't a starting assumption of your existence; it's a placeholder for the observer (you) reporting sensory data, which then leads to the conclusion of existence. Here's why:

1. "I" as a Reporting Mechanism, Not an Assertion

- When you say "I see images" or "I used data," you're not claiming "I exist" upfront. You're relaying your thought process—describing what's observed—to another person. This is like saying "The camera recorded a tree" without assuming the camera's existence; it's just the medium of observation.
- In OEM, the syllogism is a communication tool. The "I" represents the observer's experience (you), but its existence isn't asserted until proven. The reasoning builds to "I exist" as a conclusion, not a given.

2. Evidence Precedes "I"

- Abduction: Starts with data's existence (images, sounds)—sensory evidence anyone can verify (sight: images on a screen). No "I" is needed yet; it's just "data exists."
- Deduction 1: "Thinking is using data" is a general rule, observable in processes (e.g., a brain forming thoughts from sights). "I used data" is your specific observation—sight confirms you processed "data exists." Here, "I" is the subject experiencing the process, not a pre-existing entity. The conclusion "I think" emerges from evidence, not assumption.
- Deduction 2: "Awareness of thinking" is evidenced by self-reflection (sight: noticing thoughts), and "I am aware" is your report of that evidence. Only then does "I exist" conclude—no prior "I" is assumed.

3. OEM's Sensory Basis Avoids Presupposition

- OEM ties everything to physical senses. "I see" or "I think" isn't "I exist" snuck in—it's shorthand for "this observation occurs" (e.g., sight happens, thinking happens). The "I" is the locus of these observations, not a presupposed self.
- Example: If I say "The wind blows," I don't assume the wind's origin—just report its action. Similarly, "I think" reports the action (thinking), proven by data use, not an existing "I."

4. Contrast with Presupposition

- Presupposing "I exist" would be:
    - Premise 1: I exist.
    - Premise 2: I think.
    - Conclusion: I use data.

    - This begs the question—OEM forbids it.
- Instead, OEM starts with data (observable to all), moves to thinking (evidenced by data use), then to existence (evidenced by awareness)—"I" is the end, not the start. You're relaying this sequence, not asserting "I" first.

5. Communication to Another

- When you present this syllogism, you're saying: "Here's what I observed—data, then thinking, then awareness—leading me to conclude I exist." The "I" is your voice, not a claim of existence needing proof upfront. Another person could replicate it: "I see data too," following the same steps, without assuming their "I" either—existence is proven, not presumed.

OEM's Safeguard Against Anti-Logos

- Wordism Check: Assuming "I exist" without evidence is mind-dependent—anti-logos. OEM avoids this by grounding "I" in sensory steps (data → thinking → awareness).
- Totemism Check: No appeal to "everyone knows I exist"—it's your observation, verifiable by others.
- Logic Check:
    - Identity: Data is data (observed).
    - No Contradiction: Thinking can't occur without data (evidenced).
    - No Middle Ground: I think or I don't—awareness confirms I do.

The "I" emerges as a conclusion, not a hidden premise, aligning with OEM's rigor.

Explanation in Plain Terms

Think of the syllogism as a detective story you're telling:

- You notice clues (data: images, sounds).
- You figure out a pattern (thinking: using data).
- You realize you're the one solving it (awareness: I think).
- Conclusion: "Hey, I must exist to do this!"
  The "I" isn't assumed—it's the detective (you) piecing it together, reporting to someone else: "Here's how I worked it out." No existence is claimed until the evidence says so.

Conclusion

In the syllogism, "I" isn't presupposing your existence—it's you relaying your thought process, step-by-step, from observable data to the conclusion of "I exist." OEM ensures this by starting with sensory evidence (data), not an "I," and building logically. You're not saying "I exist, so…" but "Here's what I see, and it leads to me existing"—a report, not an assumption. This keeps it clean of anti-logos and true to OEM's evidence-first ethos.